Jou (5,625,894) in view of Naimpally et al. (4,207,590) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 defines a bandpass filter that includes a second and a third parallel LC element which are each coupled to a fixed reference-ground potential. Accordingly, the defined filter is a so-called "unbalanced" filter (Please see Fig. 1).

In contrast, the vertical LC elements of the filter shown in Fig. 4 of Jou are not connected to a fixed reference-ground potential, but rather are connected to input/output terminals 410, 420.

The filter shown in Fig. 4 of Jou is a so-called "balanced filter", even though this is not explicitly stated in Jou. Accordingly, the filter shown in Fig. 4 is based on differential circuit design techniques. In contrast thereto, the filter defined in claim 1 is based on single ended circuit design techniques.

Furthermore, the Examiner has argued that one of ordinary skill in the art would take the series capacitor 225 shown in Fig. 2 of Naimpally et al. and would integrate this capacitor into the circuit shown in Fig. 4 of Jou. Fig. 2 of Naimpally et al. is an unbalanced filter, and is therefore, based on single ended design techniques. First of all, one of ordinary

skill in the art would not have obtained any suggestion to take a circuit element from a single ended circuit and transfer it to a differential circuit. Secondly, Mr. Kuhn who is one of the applicants, asserts that integrating the series capacitor 225 into the circuit shown in Fig. 4 of Jou would result in a filter that simply would not work. The invention defined by claims 1-4 is patentable.

In paragraph 2 on page 3 of the Office action, claims 5-7 have been rejected as being obvious over Takayama (5,483,209) in view of Jou (5,625,894) and Naimpally et al. (4,207,590) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 5 defines a circuit configuration including a plurality of frequency domain filter paths, wherein each of the frequency domain filter paths includes at least one bandpass filter with the same limitations as those defined in claim 1. Therefore, claims 5-7 are patentable for the reasons specified above in regard to claim 1.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 1 or 5. Claims 1 and 5 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 1 or 5, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-7 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, he is respectfully requested to telephone counsel so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within a period of three-months pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of $920.00 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark P. Weichselbaum
Reg. No. 43,248

For Applicants

MPW:cgm

January 30, 2002

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101